DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 822 08 AC 012 948

TITLE The Congressional Fellowship Program: A Study and Analysis.
INSTITUTION Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. Bureau of Training.
REPORT NO CSC-Pam-T-3
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Data Analysis; *Federal Government; Federal Programs; *Government Employees; *Management Development; *Political Science; Public Administration Education; *Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive overview of purpose and content of the Program (an opportunity for Federal executives to learn first-hand about United States Congress in operation through work assignments with members of Congress and staffs of Congressional committees) and a report of reactions of participants to the Program is presented. Information for analysis was obtained from files of American Political Science Association, Civil Service Commission, post-Program evaluations prepared by Fellows, and from responses to survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first requested personal information about age, education, Federal employment, and post-Fellowship career changes, and supplied statistical data for analysis. The second elicited personal opinions of Fellows about Program and its effects. Suggested answers were listed. It was generally concluded that the Program is achieving its purposes for most Fellows. (Author/NF)

ED 068822

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Pamphlet No. T-3

THE CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

A Study and Analysis

BUREAU OF TRAINING
U.S. Civil Service Commission

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

THE CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

A Study and Analysis

Analysis and Evaluation Division
Bureau of Training
U. S. Civil Service Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Page
INTRODUCTION	
The Program	2
Background	4
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	
In General	7
The Program	8
Selection	8
Orientation	10
Office Assignment	10
Work Assignment	11
Post-Program Utilization	11
Characteristics of Fellows	13
Age	13
Sex	13
Grade	13
Education	13
Federal Service	14
Mobility	14
Promotion	15
Final Comments	16
NOMINATION AND SELECTION	
Procedures	18
Comments by Fellows	19
THE ORIENTATION	
Reactions from Fellows	21
Arrangements	21
Duration	22
General Reactions	23
Speakers	25
WORK ASSIGNMENTS	
Office Assignment System	27
Work in the Offices	29

Subject — Page

POST-PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Effects on Present Position 32
Effects upon Careers 34
Future Plans 35
Reactions of Associates 36
Final Comments 38

Table

1. Agency Participation 40
2. Age 41
3. Grade at Nomination 42
4. Education At Time of Nomination 43
5. Years Federal Service at Time of Nomination 44
6. Average Number of Federal Jobs Held 45
7. Average Number of Agencies Where Employed 46
8. Change of Jobs since Program 47
9. Participants Changing Agencies since the Program 48
10. Grade at Present 49
11. Grade Progression 50

Appendix

I. APSA 51
II. Non-Government Fellows 52
III. President's Address, September 15, 1965 54
IV. Survey Questionnaire 57
V. Responses to Survey Questionnaire 70

THE CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Introduction

In the last decade, there has been a steady increase in the number of aids, grants, and fellowships offered to Federal employees. Acceptance of them and participation in their programs have been aided by the Government Employees Training Act of 1958. One of these programs is the Congressional Fellowship Program (also known as the Fellowship in Congressional Operations) of the American Political Science Association and the Civil Service Commission.[1/] This paper presents a comprehensive overview of the Program's purpose and content, as well as a report of the reactions of participants to the Program.

Information for the analysis was obtained from the files of APSA and the Civil Service Commission, from post-Program evaluations prepared by Fellows, and from responses to a survey questionnaire.[2/] Personal data were not available on all participants, resulting in the need for the questionnaire which was mailed to the 72 Federal executives who had completed the Fellowship prior to September 1967. Sixty-three former Fellows (88%) completed and returned the questionnaire and their responses form the basis for the analysis.

The survey questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first requested personal information about age, education, Federal employment, and post-Fellowship career changes, and supplied the statistical data for the analysis. The second part elicited personal opinions of Fellows

---

1/ For a description of APSA, see Appendix I.

2/ A copy of the survey questionnaire is included as Appendix IV.

about the Program and its effects upon them. Following each question, suggested answers were listed, not to stereotype or limit responses, but to stimulate thinking along particular lines and in particular areas. Additional space was provided for adding personal comments which better reflect the Fellow's individual feelings. These comments added depth and insight to the analysis.

The Program

The Congressional Fellowship Program provides an opportunity for Federal executives to learn first-hand about the United States Congress in operation through work assignments with members of Congress and staffs of Congressional committees. The Program was established by APSA in 1953, primarily for political scientists, journalists, and attorneys. Federal Fellows were added in 1961 and still participate with APSA Fellows in all Program elements.[3/] Federal executives participate, as in other long-term training assignments, on full salary paid by their agencies. The Program is conducted in Washington, D.C., and runs for about ten months. It consists of an orientation lasting six weeks and two work assignments of four months each, one in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate.

The orientation consists of seminars, meetings, and interviews conducted by APSA. Beginning in mid-November and lasting until just before Christmas, the seminars are held at government, business, and academic locations around Washington.

3/ For a description of the non-Federal Program and procedures, see Appendix II.

The seminars cover the following topics:

The Current Congressional Scene

External Pressures on Congress

The Executive Branch

Press and Public Relations in Washington

Political Miscellany

Key members of Congressional staffs, news bureaus, and Government agencies discuss these topics and respond to questions. The orientation provides an introduction to political activity in the Nation's Capital and creates a framework for critical analysis of the role the Congress plays in American government.

During the orientation period, each Fellow negotiates for his work assignment which begins around the first of January. Before this assignment ends in late April, he completes negotiations for the second assignment which runs until the adjournment of Congress or September 1. Originally, the first assignment was with a House office and the second with a Senate office. With expansion of the Fellowship Program in recent years, assignments are reversed for some Fellows, the first being in the Senate and the second in the House. Also, work periods occasionally are varied a few weeks to accommodate office projects. However, both assignments are arranged on the personal initiative of the Fellow, the only restriction being the needs of individual offices.

Congressional Fellows serve at no cost to the employing office and have opportunity to become involved in the everyday, practical operations of the office. They have performed a wide variety of

services for their offices. Some have had responsibility for researching, drafting, and steering legislation through the House and Senate. Others have been concerned with administrative problems, assumed responsibility for speech writing, and made information-gathering trips to their Congressman's home district or State. A few have taken part in international conferences abroad, serving as staff aids, assistants, and resource specialists.

Concurrent with the work assignments, additional seminars are conducted by APSA on topics of contemporary interest. Fellows sometimes structure these themselves and often suggest particular areas for coverage. From their total experience in the Program, Fellows are expected to gain:

1. A thorough knowledge of the organization of Congress.
2. A well-balanced understanding of the legislative process and the factors and forces which influence it.
3. Some Congressional perspective of national objectives and executive branch operations.
4. A sound grasp of the scope and variety of Congressional responsibilities and their relationship to the total process of government.

Background

Although the Congressional Fellowship Program has been operating since 1953, Federal executives did not participate until 1961 when the Civil Service Commission completed negotiations with APSA and placed five Federal executives in the Program. The success of these Fellows was expected to stimulate increased agency interest and assure quality

Federal participants in subsequent Programs. This did not occur. Agency interest in the Program was low and not much importance was placed in it, and so the number of Federal Fellows remained low. Agencies seemed reluctant to nominate their better people because they did not wish to have them away for ten months or feared executives might stay with legislative offices. Others who were nominated had been in their careers too long to make use of the experience or to derive maximum benefit from it.

Efforts by the Commission to stimulate additional nominations were not successful until the President expressed his interest in the Program. In an address to former Congressional Fellows on September 15, 1965, he said,

> "Too often in our history the Executive and Legislative Branches have been reduced to suspicion and petty bickering. And too often the cause of progress has suffered because of it.
>
> "Although our Constitution divides us into separate branches, it charges all of us with the same mission -- that is, to serve the American public. Some disagreement between the branches of government is quite natural. But cooperation between the branches of Government is quite imperative.
>
> "I expect every member of my administration to understand this and to apply this to the day-to-day operations of Government.
>
> "I am not just talking about Congressional relations, I am talking about understanding the job that Congress has to do. And I am talking about trying to help the Congress do that job it has to do.
>
> "We have entered a new era, I think, of respect and good will between the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Government. I intend to do everything I can to encourage this respect and to promote this good will.
>
> "...I am today placing renewed emphasis on the Congressional Fellows Program. I want every Department and I want every

large agency of the Government to have at least one of its most promising young executives in this Program next year."4/

The emphasis the President placed on the Fellowship spurred agency interest in the Program. Even though nominations for the 1965 Program were closed at the time of the President's speech, the Civil Service Commission re-opened them and accepted seventeen Federal Fellows for that year, including the first woman participant. Since then, agency interest in the Fellowship has remained high, the quality of executives nominated has improved, and the number of participating agencies has increased.

The 72 executive branch employees who have completed the Program as of September 1967 have represented 23 different agencies (table 1). Eight agencies have participated one time only, and four are taking part for the first time in the 1967-68 Program. The size of participating agencies has been as large as the Department of Defense and as small as the Office of Emergency Planning. The Department of State has participated each year and, together with the Department of Agriculture, has sponsored more Fellows than have any other agencies (11 each). Because the Civil Service Commission limits agencies to three nominations each year, wide agency representation and diverse participant background have been assured. In the 1967-68 Program, 17 agencies are represented, the largest number in Federal history of the Program.

4/ For the full text of the President's address, see Appendix III.

Summary and Conclusions

In General

The Congressional Fellowship Program is achieving its purposes for most Fellows. Capable, promising executive branch employees are receiving valuable knowledge and insight into the organization, function, purpose, and operation of the United States Congress. Fellows become familiar, on a first-hand, on-the-job basis, with how Congress performs its job, enabling them to better understand relationships between the executive and legislative branches. Key agency employees learn to operate within the legislative framework, gaining understanding of and appreciation for the background and purposes of actions taken.

An increase in Program interest since 1965 has led to wider agency representation each year and has persuaded additional agencies to participate. A previous study of the Program in 1965 indicated that lack of publicity had resulted in a shortage of qualified nominees. Since the President's address in September of that year, this has not been a problem. The number of Fellows has increased each year and the largest group in the history of the Program (23) is participating in 1967-68. Women have taken part regularly since 1965 and three are in the current Program. Increased Program acceptance by agencies should result in even greater participation in the future.

Although a few agencies continue to confuse the objectives of the Program with local objectives such as rewarding employees, Committee screening has usually been successful in eliminating the few candidates nominated for such purposes.

CONCLUSION: The Commission should take further action to assure that agencies have planned post-training assignments for Fellows which are consistent with the purposes of the Program.

Participation by Fellows has expanded faster than has participation by offices. This has resulted in the same offices having Fellows repeatedly, with few additional offices joining the Program. The shortage of participating offices has occasionally required Fellows to take a Senate assignment first, with their House assignment second. Because of the individual orientation, nature, or philosophy of some offices, a few may never be able to utilize Fellows. However, to insure a wide range of experience, APSA should continue in its already extensive efforts to enlist additional offices in the Program.

CONCLUSION: APSA should continue to encourage additional Congressional offices to participate in the Program.

The Program

Selection: The selection process appears to be adequate and received little criticism from Fellows. Nomination criteria provided by the Civil Service Commission are generally being followed; however, close screening by the Selection Committee continues to be necessary.

CONCLUSION: The selection process is adequate for its purposes and needs no revision.

The criterion that nominees must have demonstrated their ability through holding responsible Federal Government positions is the only listed criterion requiring subjective evaluation. A nominee's work and experience history and his supervisory recommendations are reviewed by the Selection Committee before and during his personal interview. These, together with personal performance in the interview, are considered by Committee members in evaluating nominees. Therefore, recommendations must be thorough and complete to ensure their receiving proper consideration.

Participants have been at recommended grade levels, GS-12 to GS-16. However, suggestions have been made to lower the maximum grade level from GS-16 to GS-14. Under present interpretations of criteria, age range has been wide each year and most Fellows have been between 27 and 41 years of age. Neither grade nor age have been a problem for past Fellows.

CONCLUSION: Current nomination practices with reference to age and grade are satisfactory.

Since 1965 all participants have been career employees. Prior to then, four Fellows were selected who had less than two years of Federal service. Level of education has never been a problem and, while Commission criteria do not prescribe minimum education, none appears necessary. Fellows' educational levels have been rising every year and many now participating have Master's degrees.

CONCLUSION: Agencies should continue to stay within nomination criteria established by the Civil Service Commission.

A lack of recognition for being nominated and then selected has been expressed. Agencies are not uniform in announcing the selection of their Fellows and inform employees with varying degrees of

publicity. While this may not be important to all Fellows, agency publicity would add to the prestige of the Program.

CONCLUSION: The Commission should prescribe a formal announcement procedure whose format could be adapted by agencies.

Orientation: The orientation phase, including all seminars, is well received by Fellows. Its value lies in providing them an opportunity to learn the functions and operations of Congress, while bridging the change from an agency work environment to Capitol Hill activity. Criticism of the orientation phase was minor and few suggestions for improvements were made. A few Fellows wanted the orientation period lengthened and some wanted it shortened; others wanted more seminars while some wanted fewer; but none of the Fellows wanted the orientation phase eliminated.

CONCLUSION: Arrangements for the orientation and the length of the orientation are satisfactory.

The seminars conducted during the orientation were discussed in detail. Suggestions were made to add additional Congressional figures to programs to provide first-hand information on how they operate. Generally, speakers on programs received little criticism and Fellows were pleased with their knowledge and ability.

CONCLUSION: Selection of seminar speakers has been satisfactory; however, APSA should consider including additional Congressional figures on seminar programs. The seminars should be continued as a vital part of the orientation.

Office Assignment: The method used to obtain office assignments (having Fellows hold their own interviews with participating offices

during the orientation) also received little criticism. Most Fellows wanted the system and procedure to stay as they were. The interview system requires Fellows to exert their personal initiative to obtain a good assignment and can prove difficult for Fellows not adept at negotiation or being interviewed. Fellows are not hindered by APSA or the Civil Service Commission and are free to make their own commitments. No Fellow suggested a more equitable or workable system for obtaining office assignments.

CONCLUSION: No change should be made in the office assignment system.

Work Assignments: Work assignments are the most vital and meaningful part of the Program; however, they too depend upon a Fellow's own initiative for maximum effectiveness. Fellows usually negotiate good assignments and are able to adjust to or improve those they find less meaningful. As reported by many Fellows, and as is true of any training experience, individual initiative and effort increase the value a Fellow received from the Program. Although some criticism was offered about a lack of personal association with the Congressmen, Fellows understood the reasons for this. Basically, the work assignments are what each Fellow wants to make of them.

CONCLUSION: The degree of personal contact experienced between Fellows and their Congressmen is appropriate to the circumstances. The House and Senate work assignments are proving to be the most meaningful part of the Program and do not need changing.

Post-Program Utilization: The part of the Program most criticized is agency failure to utilize Fellows after completing the experience. While

some Fellows become angry or frustrated, others accept the lack of utilization and either change to agencies where their skills will be utilized or continue to perform old tasks content with the personal satisfaction of having had the Fellowship experience. Agencies should provide Fellows with assurance that the Fellowship is part of a career plan and ultimately will be utilized in the plan. The Commission and APSA rely upon agencies to do this now but cannot be certain that plans agencies furnish with their nominations are implemented when Fellows return. Assuring post-Program utilization will add to the prestige of the Fellowship and to its acceptance by employees and management.

Indications of frustration came from Fellows whose talents are not fully utilized. Although caution must be taken to avoid creating a "Crown Prince" attitude, Fellows have a right to believe the Fellowship experience is part of a plan for their future. When neither support, denial, or alternative to this belief is given, dissatisfaction has resulted. Agencies should develop such a plan, discuss it with the Fellow before he begins the Program and implement it when he returns.

CONCLUSION: Agencies should ensure that their objectives in having participants in the Congressional Fellowship Program are clearly communicated to, and understood by, management, nominating officials, and participating Fellows; the Commission should give consideration to a periodic review of all Fellows' assignments during the first year or two after they complete the Program to ensure they are being fully utilized.

Characteristics of Fellows

Age: During the seven years that Federal executives have participated in the Fellowship Program, their ages at the time of selection have ranged from 27 to 52 years (table 2). The average age has been 36.5 and the median, 36 years. Most Fellows (81%) have been between 27 and 41 years of age.

Sex: Although women were never excluded from the Program, they did not participate until 1965 after the President noted their absence from the group he addressed. Four women have completed the Fellowship thus far and three have begun the 1967-68 Program. Special or unusual treatment has neither been designed for them nor deemed necessary. As participation in future Programs increases, the number of women participating should increase.

Grade: Grade levels for Federal executives selected as Fellows have ranged from GS-11 to GS-16 (table 3). Since 1963 when a minimum grade level was suggested for nominees, no one below GS-12 has been selected. The average grade for all Program years is GS-13.4 and the median, GS-13. The greatest grade concentration (78%) has been in the GS-12 to GS-14 area, the range, generally, for managers being considered for executive positions.

Education: The educational level of participants has been rising each year and, since the 1963-64 Program, all Fellows have held at least one academic degree (table 4). Ninety-seven percent have been college graduates and 41% have held degrees above the Bachelor's level.

Although no educational requirements are listed for the Congressional Fellowship, participants' educational attainments have increased each year and 57% of the 1967-68 group hold Master's degrees.

Federal Service: The number of years of Federal service participants have at the time of their selection for the Program spans a wide range (table 5). For each year's Program, average length of service ranged from a low of 6.2 years in 1963 to a high of 15.3 in 1961. For all Fellows reporting, the average was 11.9 years. While nominations are usually limited to career employees (those with at least three years service), one Fellow in the 1962 Program and another in 1964 reported having but one year of service at his time of selection. Longest service was reported by a 1965-66 Fellow who had thirty years.

Mobility: Federal Fellows have been mobile in their work backgrounds. On the average, they have occupied four different jobs (table 6) at two different agencies (table 7) prior to being selected. While one Fellow in the 1964-65 Program reported experience in ten Federal jobs, most Fellows had held three or four. One Fellow in the 1965 Program and another in 1966 reported being employed by five different agencies; however, most Fellows had been with one or two.

Some Fellows become more mobile or develop mobility after completing the Fellowship. As evidence, 73% of the Fellows have changed jobs since the Fellowship (table 8) and 33% have changed agencies (table 9). On the other hand, the high rate of job changes following the Fellowship

may be attributed to agency executive development plans which place Fellows in different jobs upon return to the agency. Hence, 75% of the earliest group (1961-62) and 58% of the most recent (1966-67) report a change.

Although not an intention of the Program, many Fellows are presented with opportunities to remain on Capitol Hill. Fourteen percent of all past Fellows now hold positions within the legislative branch (table 9). Some Fellows have remained on the Hill to gain additional experience and complete projects, planning eventually to return to the executive branch. This may be the reason four of the five Fellows in the 1966 group who changed agencies took legislative positions.

CONCLUSION: Most Fellows are satisfied with their career progress since completing the Fellowship; and, though not always immediately apparent, Fellows are changed by the Fellowship experience.

Promotion: Program participation seems to have influenced the grade progression of Fellows. Of the 47 replying to the questionnaire who are still under the General Schedule pay system, 31 (70%) have received at least one promotion (table 10). The mean grade level for all Program years has increased from GS-13.4 to GS-14.5 and the median from GS-13 to GS-14 (table 11). Although promotion is not an objective of the Fellowship Program, most Fellows do get promoted.

CONCLUSION: Program participation appears to be a factor in influencing the promotion of Fellows.

Personal Relations: Fellows report little change in their relations with co-workers and associates back at their agencies. They are treated with respect, appreciation, and understanding. None reported personal difficulties upon returning to their agencies.

CONCLUSION: Program participation has maintained or enhanced personal relations of Fellows at their agencies.

Final Comments

Suggestions offered by Fellows mentioned two improvements that would benefit future Fellows. One asks that a meeting room be set aside for the private use of Fellows. The other requests a study list or reading guide that Fellows could follow to correct weaknesses in their backgrounds. (The second request has already been fulfilled during the most recent Program year.)

CONCLUSION: APSA should consider the value of providing a meeting room in a building on Capitol Hill for the exclusive use of Fellows and should continue to make the augmented study list available.

Participants in the Program and legislative branch members they work with consider the Program sound, effective, and worthwhile. Its value, not only within the executive and legislative branches but also among academic and journalistic communities from which APSA Fellows come, is recognized throughout the United States. As agency and department interest in training continues to increase, the number of executives available for each annual Program should also increase.

The Congressional Fellowship should continue to be an important, meaningful program, providing Federal employees with an experience unmatched by that of any other current Federal program.

CONCLUSION: Federal participation in the Congressional Fellowship Program should be continued and should be vigorously supported by the Civil Service Commission, all Federal agencies, and the Congress.

Nomination and Selection

Procedures

The Civil Service Commission sends its announcement of the Congressional Fellowship to Federal agencies in early February of each year. Nominations, which the Commission accepts until May 15, must come from agency headquarters and not from field establishments or individuals. This is done to assure thorough agency screening so that only the most promising executives are nominated.

To qualify for the Fellowship, nominees should be career employees in the GS-12 to GS-16 (or equivalent) grade range. They should occupy managerial or executive positions, or have good probability for future assignment to such positions. Nominees should also be young persons who have demonstrated a high level of ability by rapid progression through responsible Federal Government positions and by superior academic achievements. Participation in agency executive development programs gains nominees preferential consideration.

With the nomination form, the nominee's supervisor must furnish a statement describing the nominee's potential for career growth and the types of responsibility for which he is being prepared. The nominee, himself, must furnish a statement outlining his reasons for wanting to participate, his goals and objectives within the Program, and his plans to use the experience in his personal career plan. These statements are reviewed as each nominee is interviewed by the Selection Committee in late May. This committee is convened in Washington especially for this purpose and is composed of an APSA representative, one from the Civil

Service Commission, and another from elsewhere in Government. In recent years, the third member has been a former Fellow currently employed in the executive or legislative branch. The Committee evaluates nominees, negotiates and agrees on awardees, and informs the Civil Service Commission of its selections. Before July 1, the Commission notifies agency headquarters of their awardees so that each agency has the opportunity to make a formal announcement or presentation.

Comments by Fellows

Fellows were asked how they felt about the selection process, and most indicated that it met their expectations and needed little change (Question 15). Eighty-four percent of those responding thought the selection process was "adequate for its purposes". The choice selected next most often (by 19% of the respondents*) was that awardees are not given enough recognition in press releases, employee newsletters, bulletins, etc. Ten percent felt that too much time elapses between selection and start of the Program and only 6% thought the selection period too short for adequate nominee screening.

CONCLUSION: The Commission should prescribe a formal announcement procedure whose format could be adapted by agencies.

Additional comments added by Fellows imply that agencies sometimes (1) lack purposeful reasons for nominating their executives, or (2) do not exert control over the nomination process. One Fellow noted that he located application information himself and then "railroaded" his

*NOTE: Participants were not limited to one answer to each question.

own nomination through proper channels. Another said he was disappointed because his agency had given only limited consideration to his personal potential and value for having the experience. Another Fellow said his agency did little pre-selection planning and so he was not certain the Program was compatible with agency plans for him or for agency needs. Fellows want to be advised of such plans and kept informed about changes in them.

CONCLUSION: Agencies should ensure that their objectives in having participants in the Congressional Fellowship are clearly communicated to, and understood by, management, nominating officials, and participating Fellows.

The Orientation

Reactions from Fellows

In the survey questionnaire, Fellows were asked how they felt about the orientation phase of the Program with special regard to four different areas.

Arrangements: The first area for comment concerned planning, arranging, and supplying activities for the orientation (Question 16a). Sixty percent of those who returned the questionnaire indicated they encountered no difficulties. Forty-three percent felt that meetings progressed in logical sequence; no one said that information on meetings, sessions, etc., was not delivered on time; and only four Fellows said they were not allowed enough free time. On the contrary, many felt they had too much free time, wasting time between sessions, when speakers did not show up, and when travelling between meeting places. However, it was admitted that "considering the high quality resource people, it would have been difficult to schedule sessions much differently."

Included for choice in this section was the need for a consultation or study room to be provided for the exclusive use of Fellows. This subject had been mentioned each prior year in evaluations prepared by Fellows. Twenty-five percent of the Fellows who returned the questionnaire said it was needed. Such a room would permit personal interaction between Fellows and provide a place for study. As one Fellow said, "Fellows should sever ties with their agencies during the Fellowship and so they need a place to go when not in a meeting".

CONCLUSION: APSA should consider the value of providing a meeting room in a building on Capitol Hill for the exclusive use of Fellows.

A few comments were critical of Fellows themselves, one suggesting that they should spend more time studying for individual seminars. As one Fellow said, "Although everything could not be pre-planned, some questions revealed that Fellows had little conception of the purpose for their meeting and what could be learned from the guest". Along with this was a suggestion by an earlier Fellow that APSA provide an augmented reading list for Fellows to use as a study guide. During the most recent Program year (not covered by this study), APSA provided an expanded reading list to the Fellows.

CONCLUSION: APSA should continue to make the augmented study list available.

There were no serious criticisms about arrangements for the orientation. Fellows were satisfied that everything was accomplished as well as could be expected and expressed understanding for the way problems were handled.

CONCLUSION: Arrangements for the orientation are satisfactory and there is no need for changing present procedures.

Duration: The next area for comment (Question 16b) concerned the length of the orientation phase. Three possible choices covering duration were listed: too short, too long, and just about right. Eighty-three percent of those returning the questionnaire said the length was just about right. Only one Fellow said the phase was too short, but he offered no additional comment or explanation.

Of the ten Fellows who felt that the orientation lasted too long, four expressed the belief that time should have been taken from the orientation in order to permit additional time in which to seek office

assignments. This feeling was also expressed in the comments of four other Fellows who requested additional time for this purpose. This criticism seems unwarranted because office assignments are negotiated during the orientation and more time for assignment negotiations would not reduce the total period alloted to the orientation.

CONCLUSION: The length of the orientation is satisfactory and requires no change.

General Reactions: The third area for consideration (Question 16c) asked for general reactions to all the seminars. Thirteen comments were listed for choice, taken from statements made by Fellows in their earlier, post-Program evaluations. Fellows were not as critical as when they had just completed this portion of the Program, revealing a tempering of their attitudes. A statement that "the seminars were a waste of time" was selected by no one, while 68% indicated that the seminars were interesting and informative.

Over half (54%) of the respondents agreed that a broad range of topics had been covered. One Fellow who checked this comment suggested adding a "heavy dose of what-goes-on-in-a-Congressional-Office" to precede all other seminars so that Fellows could place subsequent lectures and discussions in realistic perspective.

A desire to have more Congressmen appear on seminar programs was expressed. One Fellow said, "I believe Congressmen would happily participate in the orientation if they were invited. They would add some missing color and first-person detail to the otherwise good program". This suggestion had been implied in earlier criticism that the orientation was scheduled during a period when Congress was not in session. Fellows

felt that if the orientation were conducted during a Congressional session additional legislative figures would be available to appear on programs and would also be available for work assignment interviews.

CONCLUSION: APSA should consider including additional Congressional figures on seminar programs.

Personal tastes quite naturally influenced comments but did not diminish appreciation for the orientation. One Fellow said, "In some cases, the reputation of the speaker was far better than his presentation". However, the same Fellow admitted, "The seminars did what they were intended to do, broaden the Fellow's perspective. Although sometimes wasteful, they should be retained with an increase in diversity and range of topics. Even at the risk of confusing and over-filling Fellows, hitting some worthless sessions, and preventing a neat seminar series -- the more the better!"

Thirty-eight percent of responding Fellows checked the comment "Coverage was spotty, some parts good and some poor". One of the Fellows who checked this added that "spottiness is not necessarily a disadvantage" and said that he thought spottiness "inevitable" because each Fellow has great interest in some aspects of the orientation and less in others. Fellows were generally in accord with Program functions and understood the reasons behind weaknesses that developed.

Other reactions to the seminars continued in this vein. Some Fellows wanted them shortened, others wanted them lengthened, but all considered them essential to the orientation. The seminars bridge the change from the job situation to the Congressional atmosphere and

provide an adjustment period for Fellows prior to their Congressional assignments. The seminars perform their function well and, as was gratefully acknowledged, "were an experience I could never have enjoyed except as a Fellow".

CONCLUSION: Seminars should be continued as a vital part of the orientation.

Speakers: The final area for consideration (Question 16d) asked for an evaluation of seminar speakers. Seven characteristics were listed and Fellows were requested to rate them as appropriate to most, some, or few speakers. The results were as follows*:

Characteristic	Most	Some	Few
Not well qualified in the subject	2%	7%	91%
Enthusiastic about the topic	75%	22%	4%
Unable to get material across to audience	0%	20%	80%
Gave poorly organized talk	4%	23%	73%
Were monotonous and dull	0%	18%	82%
Were evasive in answering questions	0%	33%	67%
Put too much emphasis on external pressures on Congress	8%	19%	73%

Additional comments reflected individual impressions with some concern expressed about speakers' backgrounds. One remark was that "Government speakers were not as good as those appearing from other disciplines". Another thought too many lobbyists were included on programs. Still another said there was too much emphasis on "how to

---

* Because all characteristics were not rated by each respondent, percentages were computed based on the number of Fellows rating that particular characteristic.

get things done as opposed to why they should be done". However, the Fellow who made the last statement admitted he had learned something from each speaker.

Speakers, generally, were thought to be well informed and handled their subjects well. They were rated high in quality, ability, and experience. This list of characteristics was also compiled from previous evaluations and, again, it appeared that opinions had softened since Fellows completed the Program. As one Fellow summed up, "I was very impressed by the majority of speakers. They were representative of some of the best minds in Government, journalism, and Government-related activities".

CONCLUSION: No change in the method of selecting seminar speakers is needed.

Work Assignments

Office Assignment System

The system employed for obtaining office assignments calls for the exercise of personal initiative by Fellows -- they must negotiate their own assignments. APSA provides an advisor who will listen to complaints, discuss the program, and indicate offices that are willing to accept Fellows; however, each Fellow must arrange his own House and Senate assignment with little other assistance. Offices have been criticized for making early commitments to Fellows and some Fellows have felt they wasted their time by interviewing particular offices. However, even when they did not result in an assignment, interviews provided Fellows with opportunities to get acquainted with other Congressional offices.

In the survey questionnaire, Fellows were asked to comment upon the system used to obtain office assignments (Question 17a). Previous evaluations had been critical of the system from the standpoint of time involved, need for several interviews, and negotiation talent required. However, the present system appears to be satisfactory; 58% of those Fellows reporting thought no improvement was needed and the others had only minor criticism. As one Fellow expressed it, "I thought the policy of letting Fellows seek their own assignments without pressure or counselling from APSA or CSC was extremely valuable. It tested your ingenuity and ability to fend for yourself."

This idea was carried further by another Fellow who said, "I felt that working out my own assignment was in itself an educational and valuable experience. The process gives the Fellow, the Representative, and the Senator a better opportunity to make a good selection and to develop a meaningful relationship in terms of getting the most out of the Program." Other praise for the present system said it presented great opportunity to meet and talk in depth with knowledgeable people, serving to inform the participant in a way that does not develop later.

CONCLUSION: No change in the office assignment system is needed.

Forty-one percent of the responding Fellows agreed there was need for continued Program publicity to interest additional offices in accepting Fellows. They said that the same offices continually have Fellows, some with unrewarding results both for them and for the Fellow. Other offices that could provide meaningful experiences for a Fellow while benefiting from his services have not been responsive to the Program or do not have the opportunity to interview better candidates. Fellows commented that many good offices have become disenchanted with the Program because time is spent every year on unproductive interviews while other offices are regularly staffed by Fellows who produce indifferent results.

CONCLUSION: APSA should continue to encourage additional Congressional offices to participate in the Program.

Work in the Offices

Fellows were asked to comment on their work assignments in the House and Senate (Question 17b). Thirteen comments were listed for choice and Fellows were requested to check those applicable to their House and Senate assignments. Concerning the House assignment, 59% said that work assignments had provided the most meaningful experiences of their careers; the corresponding percentage for this comment about Senate assignments was 68%. Most Fellows indicated that both assignments were meaningful and commented favorably on other positive reactions.

A negative comment among the choices concerned Fellows' being discriminated against in assigned tasks as compared to other office personnel. This received little support and one Fellow even took exception to it, stating "I was discriminated <u>for</u>, not against, in work assignments. They developed in accordance with my abilities and the immediate needs of the offices." Another Fellow, who indicated that his role in the office had not been clearly defined, added "Not withstanding this, my work and learning experience were very meaningful because I was able to range freely over a number of different assignments."

CONCLUSION: The House and Senate work assignments are proving to be the most meaningful part of the Program and do not need changing.

Of the 63 responding Fellows, 21% indicated they had little opportunity to deal personally with their Congressman in the House and 29% made the same comment with respect to the Senate. Also 20% in the House and 17% in the Senate felt they had little opportunity to observe him in action. However, one Fellow explained, "I feel it is unrealistic to expect a great deal of intimate association with the Congressman; where this happened it was an exception because (Congressmen) are so terribly overworked." Another reported, "My House assignment provided an outstanding opportunity to work with and become familiar with all activities of the Congressman because of the smallness of the office and the close relationship between the staff and the Congressman. My Senate assignment was not as close a relationship because of the size and more institutional arrangement of staffing." Close relationships depend upon the size of the office, the personality mix between the Congressman and the Fellow, and the amount of work produced by the office. A lack of understanding of this led to the comment, "My biggest disappointment in the Senate side was lack of contact with the Senator. (I believe) greater effort should be made to indoctrinate participating Congressmen on the need for greater personal concern with their Fellow."

CONCLUSION: The degree of personal contact experienced between Fellows and their Congressmen is appropriate to the circumstances.

Fellows commented (55% in the House and 58% in the Senate) that they had been unable to get involved in activity on the floor of Congress. One even lamented, "Federal Fellows are at a distinct

disadvantage by not being allowed floor privileges." It is unlikely that this criticism can be remedied because House and Senate rules forbid such activity by non-employees of either body without its unanimous consent. However, as one Fellow said in reference to the statement, "So what? There is always the Gallery!"

Little misuse of Fellow's talents was mentioned and most Fellows felt they had been given significant, worthwhile jobs. They filled a need within the offices and performed services that were educational for themselves and useful for the offices. Fellows responded (86% in the House and 89% in the Senate) that office staffs had been friendly and cooperative. Seventy-five percent of the Fellows indicated they had freedom to get what they wanted from the Program in the House; 83% in the Senate agreed. In both House and Senate assignments, 79% reported having much opportunity to learn, observe, and participate. They appreciated the confidence the Congressmen had in them, the support and cooperation they received, and the freedom they had to engage actively in the offices' work.

Post-Program Experience

Effects on Present Position

To obtain opinions of Fellows on job benefits derived from participation, the next question (number 18) was "How has the Program affected your present position?" Six comments were listed to select from, two of which received 66% of all selections made. They were: "Made it possible for me to obtain it" and "Qualified me for greater responsibility than I now have". Twelve Fellows indicated the Program had no effects on their present jobs; however, half of these were in the most recent group, 1966-67.

None of the responding Fellows credited the Program with providing them with a promotion. One Fellow who did get promoted said he was not certain whether his participation was a factor in his receiving it or not. Promotion has not been a participation incentive but does accrue to many (table 11).

Other comments by Fellows reveal satisfaction with the Program and their experiences in it. One Fellow said that he was better qualified for the responsibilities of his present job and felt he was performing more effectively in it. Another Fellow said he had developed improved understanding of, and sensitivity to, executive branch-Congressional relationships that proved valuable to him and his agency in effective administration. This feeling of personal enrichment that is also beneficial to the agency was expressed by several Fellows. They appreciate its value to their present assignments as well as for future assignments.

Fellows realize they now have a sense of perspective and objectivity about jobs, careers, and the Federal service in general. They understand functions of another branch of Government, how its mission is accomplished, and the inter-relations between it and other branches. One Fellow said, "The Fellowship experience has opened new understanding and insight into my present job and opened possibilities for an even better job. In some ways it has made my old job less significant, but not to the extent of making it unsatisfactory. The Fellowship renewed my career interests and gave me a point of view that I find quite helpful in my day-to-day work."

In contrast to the vast majority, a few Fellows believe the insight they gained through participation has yet to be utilized. They feel their current work does not call upon the experience, make use of their training, or involve their knowledge of Congressional operations. Their statements indicate that in a few instances agencies have to date failed to fully utilize their Fellows. When their experience is not utilized, Fellows may become frustrated and dissatisfied with their agencies.

CONCLUSION: The Commission should take further action to assure that agencies have planned post-training assignments for Fellows which are consistent with the purposes of the program.

Effects Upon Careers

To provide Fellows with an opportunity to reflect upon what they gained through participation, the next question (number 19) was "How has completing the Program benefited or hampered your career?" Eighty-four percent indicated their personal horizons had been widened, 59% thought participation created new opportunities for them, and 38% felt themselves qualified to accept legislative positions. Twenty-nine percent said they felt greater appreciation for their agencies and only 16% of the responding Fellows (almost half of whom were in the most recent Program) said there had been no effects. Most Fellows were satisfied with their career progress and appreciated the opportunity to be on the Congressional scene for ten months.

The effects of the Program upon careers was not drastic or startling for Fellows, even with 73% reporting a job change (table 8) and 33% reporting an agency change (table 9). They remained in the same general job areas and only ten left the executive branch of the Government. Some career effects were subtle, as with the Fellow who said the Program had added a dimension to his knowledge and skills that was missing before but could not describe it further. Another, who indicated that his personal horizons had been widened, remarked that the Program helped in understanding more about the whole Government process. Even the three Fellows who said the Program had been of

little benefit to their agencies admitted to being better qualified for additional responsibility and variety in jobs and for handling work and personal relationships.

Fellows admit to experiencing a change in their careers. Program effects often are subtle and not apparent immediately but Fellows know they are changed, as are their careers, because of the Congressional Fellowship.

CONCLUSION: Although not always immediately apparent, Fellows are changed by the Fellowship experience.

Future Plans

The next question (number 20) was "What changes in your position, career, or agency do you anticipate as a result of your participation in the Program?" Responses showed that 32 of the responding Fellows (51%) indicated they expected no change in the near future. This choice was made by Fellows from all Program years, not just the most recent where it might have been predicted. Ten percent said they expect to change career fields and 11% said they expect to change agencies.

Only 5% of the Fellows indicated they plan to leave Government service or to leave the executive branch. Twenty-one percent expect to improve their status within their present jobs and 13% indicate they will remain with their agencies and advance in career fields more rapidly.

Fellows occasionally have used the Fellowship experience as a credential for getting a job. Thirty-three percent of all past Fellows

have left their sponsoring agencies since completing the Fellowship. They have usually taken positions in areas relating to Congressional liaison, possibly because their sponsoring agencies did not provide them with this type of work. However, agencies who fail to utilize their returning Fellows are the exception rather than the rule. One Fellow reports he has received two promotions, changed career fields, and is now happily engaged in Congressional work for his agency. Several others have also changed jobs and career fields, remaining with their sponsoring agencies. Another Fellow who is happy with his new assignment at his agency said, "Due to my interests, the Congressional experience serves to enhance my effectiveness in dealing with other agencies, my objective from the beginning. From a personal standpoint, my credentials for positions in other agencies have undoubtedly improved, although at present I am not considering other alternatives."

CONCLUSION: Most Fellows are satisfied with their career progress since completing the Fellowship.

Reactions of Associates

The next question (number 21) was "In general, what have been the reactions of your associates since you completed the Program?" It was asked to determine if Fellows sensed an attitude change in fellow workers or superiors after returning to their agencies. Reactions were attributed to associates by 45 Fellows (71%) and to supervisors by 57 (81%). Some Fellows felt this question was not applicable to them and

did not answer it; other Fellows attributed reactions to one but not the other group.

Twenty-one percent of responding Fellows indicated they noticed no change in attitude by associates and 24% indicated this for supervisors. Forty-six percent stated that associates "seem to have more respect for me" and 35% selected this response for supervisors. One Fellow thought people at his agency tended to expect more legislative knowledge from him than was warranted but admitted he had been able to meet expectations.

Another Fellow noticed no particular change of attitude but "perhaps a sort of well-bred envy". He added that his nomination had given spirit and confidence to his associates who were pleased that their agency was not ignoring its employees. His co-workers were genuinely interested in his experience and seemed to enjoy hearing him discuss it. One Fellow reported that his supervisor was frustrated by his own and the agency's inability to fully utilize skills and training the Fellow had acquired, even though the Fellow himself understood the reasons.

This question provoked little additional comment, except to apologize for inability to answer the question or to praise the Program. Fellows remarked that, upon return to their agencies, co-workers generally treated them with acceptance, understanding, and appreciation.

CONCLUSION: Program participation has maintained or enhanced personal relations of Fellows at their agencies.

Final Comments

The last question (number 22) was "What comments about the Program in general and recommendations for improvements or changes can you make? Please discuss any pertinent factors not brought out above, especially rewarding aspects and low points. Do you have a greater understanding of the Congress?" It provided Fellows with the opportunity to suggest possible Program changes, elements needing improvement, and criticisms not provided for in previous questions. Response was very good; 85% responded, generally praising the Program, its benefits, and its accomplishments. Fellows agreed that they had gained greater understanding of the Congress and were better qualified executives. Criticisms related to personal desires and came in the form of suggestions pointed toward the Civil Service Commission and sponsoring agencies. They called for operational improvements and were reiterations of suggestions discussed in the text of this report.

Some comments dealt with personal rewards Fellows received from participating in the Program. One Fellow said that, besides better understanding of the Congress, he gained an appreciation for the abilities and intellects of individual Congressmen. Another remarked that he now felt personal satisfaction with his civil service career as compared to a career on Capitol Hill or anywhere else. Still another Fellow said he has a better understanding of other points of view, not only realizing that other points of view exist but also that there is a basis for their existence. He added that "any executive branch

administrator who has had this Fellowship experience will be better able to appreciate opinions which differ with his own, and will be more adaptable and flexible."

Comments are summarized by a recent Fellow who stated that the Program "has broadened my understanding of Congress, removed much of the cynicism I had about politicians generally, and made me more sympathetic to the onerous job of the Congress. Men in the United States Congress, I now know, are among the hardest working, most dedicated men in this country. Elementary though this may seem to some, for me it was something learned largely as a result of the Fellowship Program."

Table 1

AGENCY PARTICIPATION

Agency	Total 1961 - 67	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	Total 1961 - 68
Total	72	5	9	8	11	17	22	23	95
Agriculture	9	2	3	--	1	2	1	2	11
Army	2	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	3
AEC	5	--	1	--	1	1	2	--	5
CIA	3	--	--	1	--	--	2	1	4
CSC	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	2
Commerce	4	--	--	--	1	2	1	1	5
Defense 1/	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	2	3
FCC	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
GSA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
HEW 2/	7	--	2	1	1	2	1	1	8
HUD	2	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	3
Interior	6	--	--	1	1	2	2	2	8
Justice	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Labor	2	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	2
NASA	4	--	1	1	1	--	1	2	6
NSF	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	2	3
NSA	2	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	3
Navy	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2
OEO	2	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	2
OEP	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
SBA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
Smithsonian Inst.	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
State 3/	10	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	11
Transportation 4/	3	1	--	--	--	--	2	--	3
Treasury	3	--	--	--	2	--	1	--	3
U. S. Info. Agency	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
Veterans Admin.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1

1/ Includes Defense Intelligence Agency
2/ Includes National Institutes of Health
3/ Includes Peace Corps and AID
4/ Includes Federal Aviation Administration

Table 2

AGE

Age Group	Total 1961-67	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967 68	Total 1961-68
Total	69	5	9	7	11	16	21	21	90
27-31	15	--	3	3	3	4	2	3	18
32-36	23	3	--	2	5	4	9	10	33
37-41	17	1	4	2	2	3	5	5	22
42-46	12	1	2	--	1	4	4	2	14
47-51	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	2
52-55	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
Average Age	36.4	36.8	36.3	33.3	34.2	37.7	37.6	36.6	36.5
Median Age:	36								

Table 3

GRADE AT NOMINATION

Grade	Total 1961-67	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	Total 1961-68
Total	59	4	8	5	10	14	18	21	80
GS-11	4	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	4
GS-12	12	1	1	2	3	3	2	4	16
GS-13	14	1	1	1	3	5	3	8	22
GS-14	18	1	4	1	3	4	5	6	24
GS-15	9	--	--	---	--	2	7	2	11
GS-16	2	--	--	--	1	--	1	1	3
Average Grade	13.4	12.5	12.9	12.4	13.3	13.4	14.1	13.4	13.4

Median Grade: 13

Grade Range: GS-11 to GS-16

Table 4

EDUCATION AT TIME OF NOMINATION

Degree	Total 1961-67	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	Total 1961-68
Total	69	5	9	7	11	16	21	21	90
No Degree	3	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	3
Bachelor or LLB	43	2	5	5	6	11	14	7	50
Master or JD	18	1	1	1	4	5	6	12	30
PhD	5	2	1	--	1	--	1	2	7
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees	62%	40%	56%	71%	55%	69%	67%	33%	57%
Percent of Master's Degrees	26%	20%	11%	14%	36%	31%	29%	57%	32%

Table 5

YEARS FEDERAL SERVICE AT TIME OF NOMINATION

	Number Reporting	Total Years	Average
Totals	62	738	11.9
1961-62	4	61	15.3
1962-63	9	111	12.3
1963-64	6	37	6.2
1964-65	9	87	9.7
1965-66	15	198	13.2
1966-67	19	244	12.8

Table 6

AVERAGE NUMBER OF FEDERAL JOBS HELD

	Before Program	After Program
Total	3.9	1.1
1961-62	4.4	2.0
1962-63	3.7	1.1
1963-64	2.3	1.5
1964-65	3.9	1.9
1965-66	4.6	1.0
1966-67	3.8	.6

Table 7

AVERAGE NUMBER OF AGENCIES WHERE EMPLOYED

	Before Program	After Program
Total	1.9	.4
1961-62	2.7	.5
1962-63	1.4	.4
1963-64	1.3	.6
1964-65	1.8	1.2
1965-66	1.8	.3
1966-67	2.1	.2

Table 8

CHANGE OF JOBS SINCE PROGRAM

	Number Reporting	Number Changing	Percent of Those Reporting
Total	63	46	73
1961-62	4	3	75
1962-63	9	7	78
1963-64	6	5	83
1964-65	10	8	80
1965-66	15	12	80
1966-67	19	11	58

Table 9

PARTICIPANTS CHANGING AGENCIES SINCE THE PROGRAM

	Number Reporting	Number Changing	Percent of Those Reporting	Number Taking Leg. Pos.	Percent of Those Reporting	Percent of Those Changing
Total	72	24	33	10	14	42
1961-62	5	2	40	--	--	--
1962-63	9	3	33	1	11	33
1963-64	8	3	38	1	13	33
1964-65	11	6	55	3	27	50
1965-66	17	5	29	1	6	20
1966-67	22	5	23	4	18	80

Table 10

GRADE AT PRESENT (GS ONLY)

Grade	Total 1961-67	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67
Total	47	4	7	4	7	12	13
GS-13	8	1	1	1	--	4	1
GS-14	15	1	1	2	2	3	6
GS-15	18	1	4	1	4	3	5
GS-16	5	1	1	--	--	2	1
GS-17	1	--	--	--	1	--	--
Average Grade	14.5	14.5	14.7	14	15	14.3	14.5

Median Grade: GS-14

Mean Grade: GS-14.5

Grade Range: GS-13 to GS-17

Table 11

GRADE PROGRESSION (GS ONLY)

Program Year	At Nomination			At Present		
	Range	Median	Mean	Range	Median	Mean
Total	11-16	13.0	13.4	13-17	14.0	14.5
1961-62	11-14	12.5	12.5	14-16	14.5	14.5
1962-63	11-14	13.5	12.9	13-16	15.0	14.7
1963-64	11-14	12.0	12.4	13-15	14.0	14.0
1964-65	12-16	13.0	13.3	14-17	15.0	15.0
1965-66	12-15	13.0	13.4	13-16	14.0	14.3
1966-67	12-16	14.0	14.1	13-16	14.0	14.5

APPENDIX I

APSA

The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903 as a professional organization for political science in the United States. It is organized for the objective and scientific study, teaching, and practice of political science, public affairs, and government. APSA supports no political party or candidate, and does not take positions of public policy not immediately concerned with APSA's direct purposes. Membership is composed of Government officials, journalists, businessmen, teachers, attorneys, and judges, as well as ambassadors and political scientists from other countries.

Along with sponsoring research and training programs related to political science, APSA uses the talents of political scientists from all over the country to perform organized public services. Recipients of these services are: the President; Federal and State Government officials; attorneys; educators; and others active in the business world. APSA is the American affiliate of the International Political Science Association and quarterly publishes the American Political Science Review.

APPENDIX II

NON-GOVERNMENT FELLOWS

APSA has conducted the Congressional Fellowship Program since 1953. It was originally intended for American political scientists, journalists, law school faculty members, social science teachers, and social psychologists. In recent years, these last two groups have not participated. Since 1961, Federal executives have taken part under agreements negotiated with APSA. The Fellowship Program is the same for Government and non-Government Fellows: both participate in the same orientation and work assignments. Differences between the two arise in selection criteria and processes.

Each year in mid-September, APSA announces competition for the Fellowships it will sponsor. About twenty are awarded each year: seventeen or eighteen to political scientists and journalists, and one or two to law school professors. Competition announcements are sent to academic, legal, journalism, and other professional groups throughout the country and applications for the Fellowship are accepted until December 1. Preference in selection is given to applicants in the 23 to 35 year age group and to those who lack extensive experience in the Washington, D. C., area. Political scientists must have completed or nearly completed a Doctor's degree in political science, and preference is given to those who intend to teach. Journalists must have a Bachelor's degree and at least two years' professional experience in newspaper, magazine, radio, or television work. Law school faculty members must have a law degree and at least one year of experience teaching in an accredited law school.

Applications are reviewed in Washington by APSA's Screening Committee, consisting of a political scientist, a journalist, and a Government official. The Committee selects about fifty applicants to appear before regional interviewing boards set up around the country. These boards also are composed of a political scientist and a journalist, with a third member chosen from a field related to the applicant's background. Detailed reports on all interviewees are returned to the Screening Committee where a list of recommended awardees and alternates is prepared. From this list, final selection is made by the Congressional Fellowship Programs Advisory Committee. It is composed of two Representatives and two Senators (a Republican and a Democrat from each body), one journalist, four political scientists, and two agency heads from the executive branch of Government. The Advisory Committee announces its awards by March 1, allowing Fellows time to organize their affairs before the Program begins in November. APSA's Fellows receive a minimum stipend of $6,000 with some upward adjustment based on the number of dependents and the Fellow's professional standing.

Occasionally, one or two Fellows are sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund (Harkness Fellows), the Bush Foundation, the Canadian Political Science Association, or the Asia Foundation. These sponsors negotiate independently with APSA for participation by their Fellows and establish their own criteria for application and selection. Stipends and allowances are determined by these sponsors, consistent with their program goals.

APPENDIX III

CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM

The President's Remarks Upon Meeting with the Fellows in the Cabinet Room. September 15, 1965.

Chairman Macy, Congressional Fellows, and friends:

Since assuming the Presidency nearly 2 years ago, I have made 370 appointments to the executive branch of the Government. About half of those selected for these positions were career Government employees. This will continue to be the trend for the future. Where talent and imagination and experience exist in this Government, we are going to seek it out.

You have been sought out on the basis of your achievements. Your horizons have been broadened. Your future is one of opportunity. It is entirely possible that among you today are Cabinet officers and heads of agencies for tomorrow.

The year's experience that you just received in the Congressional Fellowship program represents an invaluable addition to your careers. No high Government official can be completely effective if he does not understand the role of Congress in our democracy.

Too often in our history the executive and legislative branches have been reduced to suspicion and to petty bickering. And too often the cause of progress has suffered because of it.

Although our Constitution divides us into separate branches, it charges all of us with the same mission -- that is, to serve the American public. Some disagreement between the branches of Government is quite natural. But cooperation between the branches of Government is quite imperative.

I expect every member of my administration to understand this and to apply this to the day-to-day operations of the Government.

I am not just talking about congressional relations, I am talking about understanding the job that Congress has to do. And I am talking about trying to help the Congress do that job that it has to do.

We have entered a new era, I think, of respect and good will between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. I intend to do everything I can to encourage this respect and to promote this good will.

Because of the experience you have gained in the Congressional Fellowship program, I am charging each of you with the responsibility of helping me in this important task. You have gained new insight and new attitudes. So your task now is to pass them to the Federal executives and the managers with whom you work.

Further, I am today placing renewed emphasis on the Congressional Fellows program. I want every department and I want every large agency of the Government to have at least one of its most promising young executives in this program next year. And next year when I address the group of Fellows, I want to be able to look out and I want to see some pretty faces out there. There hasn't been a woman enrolled in the four-year history of the program. I don't like that and I don't really see any reason for it. In fact, I deplore it.

I am glad you are here. You cheer me with your zeal and with your purpose. I have not the slightest idea but what you will find in the

years to come that this has been a great experience for you and for your country. And next year's program is going to be better than this year's.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

In announcing the meeting the Assistant Press Secretary, Joseph Laitin, stated that the Congressional Fellows, a group of approximately 30, were career civil service employees detailed for a short period to Members of Congress and congressional committees to learn about the legislative branch of the Government.

APPENDIX IV

CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Personal Data

1. During what years were you a Congressional Fellow? _____

2. What was your age at the time you began the Fellowship Program? ____

3. What was your highest academic degree at the time of the award? _____

4. How many years of Federal civilian service did you have at the time of the award? _____

5. What was your grade at the time of the award? _____

6. What is your present grade? _____

7. What agency were you employed by at the time of the award?

_____

8. What agency or organization are you employed by now?

_____

9. How many different Federal agencies had you been employed by at the time of the award (include employing agency at the time of the award)? _____

10. How many additional Federal agencies have you been employed by since you completed the program (exclude employing agency at the time of the award)? _____

11. What was your job title and occupational code (if known) at the time of the award?

_____

12. What is your present job and occupational code?

_____

13. How many different Federal civilian jobs had you held at the time of your award (consider as one job positions which did not change significantly in duties performed regardless of changes in title or grade)? _____

14. How many additional Federal jobs have you held since you completed the program? _____

II. Program Reactions

(In questions 15 through 21, please check those statements or phrases that describe your opinions. These responses were selected from evaluations completed by earlier Congressional Fellows at the conclusion of their programs. Do not, however, feel limited to the listed responses. Space has been provided following each question for you to make additional comments or explanations. Feel free to use the backs of the questionnaire pages for further statements.)

15. How do you feel about the process of selecting Fellows?

Selection period is too short to screen nominees adequately _____

Awardees are not given enough recognition (in press releases, employee newsletters, bulletins, etc.) _____

Too much time elapses between selection and start of the program _____

Interviewers don't ask appropriate questions _____

Selection process is adequate for its purposes _____

Additional comments or explanations:

16. How do you feel about the orientation phase of the program?

a. Planning, arrangements, etc.

Information on meetings, sessions, etc., was not delivered to Fellows in time _____

Meetings progressed in logical sequence _____

Fellows were not allowed enough free time _____

A study or consultation room should be provided for the exclusive use of Fellows _____

No difficulties were encountered _____

Additional comments or explanations:

16. (continued)

b. Length of orientation phase

too short _____

too long _____

just about right _____

Additional comments or explanations:

16. (continued)

c. General reaction to the seminars

Too many subjects were covered ____

Coverage was spotty - some parts good, some poor ____

Covered a broad range of topics ____

Seminars did not prepare Fellows for Congressional assignments ____

Seminars were poorly organized ____

Material covered was too elementary for Washington-based Fellows ____

Fellows were not given agenda for pre-course study ____

Seminars permitted only limited participation by Fellows in discussions ____

Little briefing was given Fellows before seminar began ____

Fellows had little to say about structuring seminars ____

They were interesting and informative ____

They were a waste of time ____

They were the most meaningful part of the program ____

Additional comments or explanations:

16. (continued)

d. Speakers in general

(Check appropriate column for each comment)

	most	some	few
Not well qualified in the subject	____	____	____
Enthusiastic about the topic	____	____	____
Unable to get material across to the audience	____	____	____
Gave poorly organized talk	____	____	____
Were monotonous and dull	____	____	____
Were evasive in answering questions	____	____	____
Put too much emphasis on external pressures on Congress	____	____	____

Additional comments or explanations:

17. How do you feel about your House and Senate work assignments?

a. Office assignment system

More or better publicity for program is needed so that additional offices will accept Fellows ____

Fellows should be arbitrarily assigned to offices ____

Some offices should be prevented from having Fellows ____

All Congressional offices should be required to accept Fellows ____

Fellows should rotate among several offices ____

Information system is needed to explain personal requirements of individual offices ____

Fellows should be interviewed by all participating offices before any assignments are made ____

Little opportunity was given to negotiate for a particular office ____

No improvement is needed in the present system ____

Additional comments or explanations:

17. (continued)

b. Work in the offices

(Put checks in appropriate columns)

	House	Senate
It was one of the most meaningful experiences of my career	____	____
My role in the office was never clearly defined	____	____
My work assignment was not what program publicity led me to expect	____	____
The office staff was not familiar with the purpose of Fellows	____	____
The office staff was friendly and cooperative	____	____
I was given freedom to get what I wanted from the program	____	____
I was given little opportunity to express myself	____	____
I was given much opportunity to learn, observe, and participate	____	____
I was discriminated against in task assignments as compared with other office personnel	____	____
I was given "busy-work" to keep me out of the way	____	____
I had little opportunity to deal personally with the Congressman	____	____
I was not able to get involved in activity of the floor of Congress	____	____
I had little opportunity to observe the Congressman in action	____	____

Additional comments or explanations:

18. How has the program affected your present position?

Made it possible for me to obtain it _____

Detracted from it by keeping me away for ten months _____

Made me dissatisfied with it _____

Qualified me for greater responsibility than I have _____

Can't tell as yet _____

Has not changed it _____

Additional comments or explanations:

19. How has completing the program benefited or hampered your career?

Had no effects as yet ____

Widened my personal horizons ____

Created new opportunities for me ____

Qualified me for a legislative position ____

Made me miss a promotional opportunity that came up while I was away from the agency ____

Gave me greater appreciation for my agency ____

Put me ahead of others on the agency career ladder ____

Additional comments or explanations:

20. What changes in your position, career, or agency do you anticipate as a result of your participation in the program?

Expect to change career fields _____

Will get promotion _____

Plan to change agencies _____

Plan to stay in the agency but progress in my career field more rapidly _____

Plan to leave Government service _____

Plan to leave the executive branch of the Government _____

Will improve status in present position _____

Expect no change in the near future _____

Additional comments or explanations:

21. In general, what have been the reactions of your associates and supervisors to you personally since you completed the program?

	Associates	Supervisors
Are distrustful and suspicious of me	____	____
Are resentful of my participation in the program	____	____
Expect too much from me now	____	____
Seem to have more respect for me	____	____
Don't recognize my present potential	____	____
Have not changed	____	____

Additional comments or explanations:

22. What comments about the program in general and recommendations for improvements or changes can you make? Please discuss any pertinent factors not brought out above, especially rewarding aspects and low points. Do you have greater understanding of the Congress?

Question 15. How do you feel about the process of selecting Fellows?

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Selection period is too short to screen nominees adequately.	4	6	--	--	1	1	1	1
Awardees are not given enough recognition.	12	19	1	--	2	2	3	4
Too much time elapses between selection and start of program.	6	10	--	2	--	--	--	4
Interviewers don't ask appropriate questions.	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	1
Selection process is adequate for its purpose.	53	84	3	7	5	7	13	18
Total responses	76		4	9	8	10	17	28

Question 16. How do you feel about the orientation phase of the program?

a. Planning, arrangements, etc.

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Information on meetings, sessions, etc., was not delivered in time.	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Meetings progressed in logical sequence.	27	43	1	5	2	4	8	7
Fellows were not allowed enough free time.	4	6	--	--	--	1	--	3
A study or consultation room should be provided.	16	25	--	3	1	2	5	5
No difficulties were encountered.	38	60	4	5	5	6	6	12
TOTALS	85		5	13	8	13	19	27

Question 16. (continued)

b. Length of orientation phase.

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Too short	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	1
Too long	10	16	--	5	1	--	--	4
Just About Right	52	83	4	4	5	10	15	14
Totals	63		4	9	6	10	15	19

Question 16. (continued)

c. General reaction to the seminars.

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Too many subjects were covered.	1	2	--	--	1	--	--	--
Coverage was spotty -- some parts good, some poor	24	38	--	4	3	3	7	7
Covered a broad range of topics	34	54	1	4	3	5	8	13
Seminars did not prepare Fellows for Congressional assignments	8	13	--	2	--	2	2	2
Seminars were poorly organized	3	5	--	1	--	1	1	--
Material covered was too elementary for Washington-based Fellows	5	8	--	2	1	--	2	--
Fellows were not given agenda for pre-course study	9	14	--	--	1	3	3	2
Seminars permitted only limited participation in discussions	7	11	--	1	1	1	--	4
Little briefing was given Fellows before seminars began	13	20	--	3	--	1	4	5
Fellows had little to say about structuring seminars	12	19	--	3	1	--	2	6
They were interesting and informative	43	68	2	5	3	7	12	14
They were a waste of time	0		--	--	--	--	--	--
They were the most meaningful part of the program	5	8	--	--	2	1	--	2
Totals	164		3	25	16	24	41	55

Question 16. (continued)

d. Speakers in general

	Total			1961-62			1962-63			1963-64			1964-65			1965-66			1966-67		
	Most	Some	Few	M	S	F	M	S	F	M	S	F	M	S	F	M	S	F	M	S	F
Not well qualified in subject	1	3	41	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-	4	-	2	7	-	-	11	1	-	12
Enthusiastic about topic	42	12	2	2	-	-	7	1	-	5	-	1	6	3	-	9	3	1	13	5	-
Unable to get material across	0	11	38	-	-	-	-	2	5	-	-	4	-	3	6	-	4	10	-	2	13
Gave poorly organized talk	2	12	35	-	-	-	1	1	6	-	-	5	-	4	5	-	3	8	1	4	11
Were monotonous and dull	0	7	46	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-	5	-	2	7	-	3	10	-	1	17
Were evasive answering questions	0	15	32	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	3	1	-	3	6	-	3	8	-	2	13
Put too much emphasis on external pressures on Congress	3	7	28	-	-	-	-	2	3	1	1	2	-	-	6	2	3	6	-	1	11
Totals	48	67	222	2	-	-	8	12	32	6	4	22	6	17	37	11	19	54	15	15	77

Question 17. How do you feel about your House and Senate work assignments?

a. Office assignment system

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
More or better publicity needed so more offices will accept Fellows	26	41	--	3	1	2	11	9
Fellows should be arbitrarily assigned to offices	0		--	--	--	--	--	--
Some offices should be prevented from having Fellows	3	5	--	--	1	--	1	1
All Congressional offices should be required to accept Fellows	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	1
Fellows should rotate among several offices	4	6	--	1	1	--	--	2
Information system needed to explain requirements of individual offices	20	32	1	2	2	4	5	6
Fellows should be interviewed by all offices before assignments are made	5	8	--	1	--	1	2	1
Little opportunity was given to negotiate for a particular office	3	5	--	1	--	1	1	--
No improvement is needed in the present system	36	57	3	5	5	6	5	12
Totals	98		4	13	10	14	25	32

Question 17. continued

b. Work in the offices

	Total House	Total Senate	Percent of All House	Percent of All Senate	1961-62 H	1961-62 S	1962-63 H	1962-63 S	1963-64 H	1963-64 S	1964-65 H	1964-65 S	1965-66 H	1965-66 S	1966-67 H	1966-67 S
One of the most meaningful experiences	37	43	59	68	3	4	6	7	2	3	5	8	10	8	11	13
My role never clearly defined	9	7	14	11	1	1	2	1	1	2	--	--	2	2	3	1
My assignment not as expected	1	2	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--
Office staff not familiar with the Program	13	7	21	11	2	--	3	1	2	1	--	--	2	1	4	4
Office staff friendly and cooperative	54	56	86	89	3	4	7	7	4	4	8	10	14	13	18	18
I was given freedom in program	47	52	75	83	3	4	5	6	5	5	8	9	11	11	15	17
Given little opportunity	8	3	13	5	1	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	3	1
Given much opportunity	50	50	79	79	4	4	6	6	5	5	7	9	12	10	16	16
I was discriminated against	5	4	8	6	1	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	1	2	1	1
I was given "busy-work"	1	2	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	1	--	--
Little chance to deal personally with the Congressman	13	18	21	29	1	1	4	4	--	1	2	--	3	6	3	6
Unable to get involved in activity on floor of Congress	35	37	56	59	4	4	6	4	3	2	6	6	9	9	7	12
Little chance to observe Congressman in action	13	11	21	17	1	1	3	2	--	--	3	--	2	3	4	5
Totals	286	292			24	24	45	38	23	24	39	42	70	70	85	94

Question 18. How has the program affected your present position?

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Made it possible for me to obtain it	30	48	2	3	2	8	7	8
Detracted from it by keeping me away for ten months	2	3	--	--	--	--	1	1
Made me dissatisfied with it	5	8	--	2	--	--	1	2
Qualified me for greater responsibility than I have	23	37	1	5	3	2	6	6
Can't tell as yet	8	13	1	--	1	1	2	3
Has not changed it	12	19	--	1	2	--	3	6
Totals	80		4	11	8	11	20	26

Question 19. How has completing the program benefited or hampered your career?

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Had no effects as yet	10	16	--	--	2	--	4	4
Widened my personal horizons	53	84	3	8	4	10	14	14
Created new opportunities for me	37	59	1	4	4	8	9	11
Qualified me for a legislative position	24	38	--	2	4	6	5	7
Made me miss a promotion that came up while I was away	2	3	--	--	--	1	--	1
Gave me greater appreciation for my agency	18	29	1	2	3	3	4	5
Put me ahead of others on the agency career ladder	3	5	1	1	--	1	--	--
Total	147		6	17	17	29	36	42

Question 20. What changes in your position, career, or agency do you anticipate as a result of your participation in the program?

	Total	Percent of All Reporting	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Expect to change career fields	6	10	--	--	--	2	2	2
Will get promotion	3	5	--	--	--	--	1	2
Plan to change agencies	7	11	1	1	1	--	2	2
Plan to stay with my agency but progress in career more rapidly	8	13	1	2	1	--	--	4
Plan to leave Government service	3	5	--	--	--	1	--	2
Plan to leave executive branch	3	5	--	--	--	--	--	3
Will improve status in present job	13	21	--	1	3	2	2	5
Expect no change in near future	32	51	1	5	3	6	11	6
Totals	75		3	9	8	11	18	26

Question 21. In general, what have been the reactions of your associates and supervisors since you completed the program?

	Total		Percent of Total		1961 - 62		1962 - 63		1963 - 64		1964 - 65		1965 - 66		1966 - 67	
	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup	Aso	Sup
Are distrustful and suspicious of me	0	3	0	5	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--
Are resentful of my participation in the program	2	4	3	6	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	1	--	1	--	1
Expect too much from me now	1	1	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--
Seem to have more respect for me	29	22	46	35	2	2	6	5	2	1	4	3	5	4	10	7
Don't recognize my present potential	0	6	0	10	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	3	--	2
Have not changed	13	15	21	24	--	--	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	3	6	7
Totals	45	51			2	4	7	7	4	3	8	8	8	12	16	17

ERIC Clearinghouse
NOV 1 3 1972
on Adult Education
GPO 864-780